

09/994,823

In response to office action dated 12/16/2003

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Claim 1, 5, 10 and 11 have been amended to provide appropriate antecedent basis. Claims 6-8, which were rejected as being dependent on rejected base claims, should now be allowable in light of amendments to the rejected base claims.

#### Rejections Under 112

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 5-8, 10 and 11 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that in Claim 1, step (b), the phrase "the resin" has no antecedent basis. Applicant has amended the claim to delete the phrase containing "the resin." Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider Claim 1, as amended.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 5, stating that Applicant should change "or" to "and" to provide proper Markush language. Applicant has amended Claim 5 accordingly, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider Claim 5, as amended.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 10, stating that in step (b), the phrase "the resin" has no antecedent basis. Applicant has amended the claim to delete the phrase containing "the resin." Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider Claim 10, as amended.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 11, stating that the phrase "the resin" has no antecedent basis, and that the "or" in line 6 should be changed to "and" to provide proper Markush

09/994,823

In response to office action dated 12/16/2003

language. Applicant has amended Claim 11 accordingly, and respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider Claim 5, as amended.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider Claims 6-8, which were rejected as being dependent on rejected base claims, in light of Applicant's current amendments to those base claims.


09/994,823

In response to office action dated 12/16/2003

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner allow Claims 6-8 and Claims 1, 5, 10 and 11, as amended.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Julia Cook Moody  
Reg. No. 48,931  
U. S. Department of Energy  
Washington, DC 20585  
202-586-3815

Attachments

Dated: March 16, 2004